

1 KUANG-BAO P. OU-YOUNG  
2 1362 Wright Avenue  
3 Sunnyvale, California 94087  
4 (408) 736-7793  
5 [kbuouyoung@yahoo.com](mailto:kbuouyoung@yahoo.com)

6  
7 Defendant-Intervenor Applicant Pro Se  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	Case No. CR14-00380CRB
Plaintiff,	)	DEFENDANT-INTERVENOR
vs.	)	APPLICANT'S NOTICE OF MOTIONS
FEDEX CORPORATION,	)	AND MOTION TO INTERVENE AND
FEDEX EXPRESS, INC., and	)	MOTION TO DISQUALIFY JUDGE
FEDEX CORPORATE SERVICES, INC.,	)	
Defendants,	)	Date: August 20, 2014
KUANG-BAO P. OU-YOUNG,	)	Time: 2:00 p.m.
Defendant-Intervenor Applicant.	)	Courtroom 6, 17 <sup>th</sup> Floor
		Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer

## **NOTICE OF MOTIONS AND MOTIONS**

TO PLAINTIFF, DEFENDANTS, AND THEIR COUNSELS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on August 20, 2014, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in Courtroom 6, 17<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco Courthouse, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, the Honorable Charles R. Breyer presiding, applicant Kuang-Bao P. Ou-Young will, and hereby does move, for the Court's permission to intervene in the present litigation. Simultaneously, applicant will, and hereby does move, to disqualify district judge Charles R. Breyer as presiding judge in the present case. The motion to intervene is based on Rule 12(b)(3)(B) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, this notice of motions and motions, the memorandum of points and authorities set forth below, the pleadings and records on file in this case, and upon such further evidence and argument as the Court may consider at the time of the hearing on these motions.

## **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

1. On February 2, 2010, applicant filed a civil case against the United States Postal Service (the “Postal Service”) (Case No. C10-00464RS, “Docket A”). On June 10, 2011, district judge Richard Seeborg issued a summary judgment and dismissed the case. Doc. Nos. A53, A54.

2. On May 31, 2012, applicant filed a civil case against four postal employees (Case No. C12-02789LHK, "Docket B"). Case C12-02789LHK resulted from the postal employees' presentation of false declarations in defense of the Postal Service in case C10-00464RS. As defense counsel in the case, U.S. attorney Melinda Haag and assistant U.S. attorney James A. Scharf moved to dismiss case C12-02789LHK on August 9, 2012. Doc. No. B20. On November 9, 2012, district judge Lucy H. Koh dismissed case C12-02789LHK. Doc. No. B28. Judge Koh denied applicant's motion to vacate the judgment dismissing case C12-02789LHK on June 10, 2013. Doc. No. B48.

1       3.     In response to judge Koh's denial of the motion to vacate judgment in case C12-  
2 02789LHK, applicant filed a civil action on September 25, 2013 (Case No. C13-04442EMC,  
3 "Docket E"). As defense counsel in the case, U.S. attorney Haag and assistant U.S. attorney  
4 Claire T. Cormier moved to dismiss case C13-04442EMC on November 5, 2013. Doc. No. E24.  
5 On December 20, 2013, district judge Edward M. Chen dismissed case C13-04442EMC. With  
6 the same order, judge Chen subjected applicant's further complaints to "pre-filing review" by the  
7 "general duty judge." Doc. No. E40.

8       4.     Acting under judge Chen's order dismissing case C13-04442EMC, district judges  
9 Ronald M. Whyte, Richard Seeborg, and Jeffery S. White dismissed applicant's subsequent  
10 complaints before allowing applicant to file (Case Nos. C14-80017RMW, C14-80018RS, and  
11 C14-80028JSW). These rulings were rendered to deny applicant procedural due process  
12 guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution. As a result, applicant submitted his  
13 second petition for impeachment against named judges to members of the House Judicial  
14 Committee on April 25, 2014.

15       5.     Substantial grounds for impeachment were left out of the April 25, 2014 petition  
16 for the sake of brevity. Hence applicant brought a more detailed civil complaint to the San Jose  
17 division on June 10. Still acting under judge Chen's order dismissing case C13-04442EMC, the  
18 receiving clerk assigned the complaint to district judge Beth Labson Freeman for pre-filing  
19 review (Case No. C14-80174BLF, "Docket MF").

20       6.     On March 24, 2014, the United States instituted a criminal action against a certain  
21 individual a/k/a "Raymond Chow" as well as others (Case No. CR14-00196CRB, "Docket G").  
22 On July 7, 2014, applicant moved to intervene in case CR14-00196CRB. Doc. No. G344. On  
23 July 8, judge Breyer denied applicant's initial motion to intervene before the United States  
24 opposed the motion. Doc. No. G345.

7. In response to applicant's initial motion to intervene in case CR14-00196CRB, judge Freeman dismissed case C14-80174BLF before allowing applicant to file on July 8, 2014.

8. On July 17, 2014, U.S. attorney Haag filed an indictment with the district court, thereby instituting the current criminal action against defendants. Doc. No. 1.

9. On July 22, 2014, applicant moved to intervene again in case CR14-00196CRB and to disqualify judge Breyer from the case. Doc. No. G367. On July 24, judge Breyer denied applicant's second motion to intervene in case CR14-00196CRB. Doc. No. G368. The denial led to both the present motion to intervene and the present motion to disqualify judge.

## **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

#### **A. Dismissal of Case C14-80174BLF Has Denied Applicant Procedural Due Process**

On July 8, 2014, judge Freeman dismissed the complaint in case C14-80174BLF before allowing applicant to file. “The fundamental requisite of due process of law is the opportunity to be heard.” *Grannis v. Ordean*, 234 U.S. 385, 394 (1914). In *Snyder v. Massachusetts*, 291 U.S. 97, 105 (1934), the Supreme Court has held that a due process is violated if a practice or rule “offends some principle of justice so rooted in the traditions and conscience of our people as to be ranked as fundamental.” Accordingly, judge Freeman’s dismissal order has denied applicant procedural due process in violation of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution.

**B. Dismissal of Case C14-80174BLF Acknowledges All Claims in the Dismissed Complaint**

On July 8, 2014, judge Freeman dismissed the complaint in case C14-80174BLF before allowing applicant to file. ¶ 7. Because the dismissal was rendered without defendants' answer, judge Freeman's dismissal of the complaint in case C14-80174BLF acknowledges all claims in the complaint.

## **C. U.S. Attorney Haag Lacks Jurisdiction in Filing the Current Indictment**

Claim 21 in the complaint in case C14-80174BLF shows that the motion to dismiss case C12-02789LHK interferes with *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232 (1974). Claim 105 in the same complaint shows that the motion to dismiss case C13-04442EMC interferes with *Scheuer* as well as *Mireles v. Waco*, 502 U.S. 9 (1991). Hence U.S. attorney Haag has fabricated both the motion to dismiss case C12-02789LHK and the motion to dismiss case C13-04442EMC in violation of 18 U.S.C. §§ 1509, 1512(b), and 1512(c).

Rule 11-6(a) of Civil Local Rules provides:

**General.** In the event that a Judge has cause to believe that an attorney has engaged in unprofessional conduct, in addition to any action authorized by applicable law, the Judge may do any or all of the following:

- (1) Refer the matter to the Court's Standing Committee on Professional Conduct; or
- (2) Refer the matter to the Chief District Judge with the recommendation that an order to show cause be issued under Civil L.R. 11-7. ...

Until U.S. attorney Haag's violations of 18 U.S.C. 1509, 1512(b), and 1512(c) in both case C12-02789LHK and case C13-04442EMC are resolved under Civil L.R. 11-6(a), U.S. attorney Haag lacks standing in practicing before the Court. Accordingly, the current indictment filed by U.S. attorney Haag on July 17 represents a defect. ¶ 8. More importantly, U.S. attorney Haag lacks jurisdiction in filing the current indictment. The present case should be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(3)(B) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure.

## **D. Judge Breyer Should Recuse Himself from the Present Litigation**

On July 8, 2014, judge Breyer denied applicant's initial motion to intervene in case CR14-00196CRB before the United States opposed the motion. ¶ 6. The denial interferes with Rule 47-2(d) of Criminal Local Rules. Judge Breyer has violated 18 U.S.C. §§ 1509, 1512(b), and 1512(c) as a result. Due to the deliberate violations, applicant moved to intervene in case CR14-00196CRG again and to disqualify judge Breyer on July 22. ¶ 9.

1 28 U.S.C. § 144 provides:

2 Whenever a party to any proceeding in a district court makes and files a timely  
3 and sufficient affidavit that the judge before whom the matter is pending has a  
4 personal bias or prejudice either against him or in favor of any adverse party,  
5 such judge shall proceed no further therein, but another judge shall be assigned  
6 to hear such proceeding.

7  
8 Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 144, another judge, other than judge Breyer, should adjudicate on either  
9 applicant's second motion to intervene in case CR14-00196CRB or the simultaneous motion to  
10 disqualify judge Breyer. Yet judge Breyer denied applicant's second motion to intervene in case  
11 C14-00196CRB on July 24. ¶ 9. Hence the denial interferes with 28 U.S.C. § 144. Again, judge  
12 Breyer has violated 18 U.S.C. §§ 1509, 1512(b), and 1512(c).

13 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) provides:

14 Any justice, judge, or magistrate judge of the United States shall disqualify  
15 himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be  
16 questioned.

17  
18 Judge Breyer has committed criminal offenses twice in case C14-00196CRB to render biased  
19 rulings in favor of plaintiff, the United States. Because the United States represents the plaintiff  
20 in the present case as well, it is reasonable to question judge Breyer's impartiality in the present  
21 proceedings. Thus, judge Breyer should be disqualified from the present litigation pursuant to 28  
22 U.S.C. § 455(a).

## **CONCLUSION**

Based on the above arguments, the Court should allow applicant to intervene in the present litigation. At the same time, judge Breyer should be disqualified from the present case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 455(a).

Respectfully submitted this 1<sup>st</sup> day of August 2014.

Kuang-bao Ou-yang

KUANG-BAO P. OU-YOUNG  
1362 Wright Avenue  
Sunnyvale, California 94087  
(408) 736-7793  
kbouyoung@yahoo.com

### Defendant-Intervenor Applicant

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )  
                                  )  
Plaintiff,                   )                                   Case No. CR14-00380CRB  
                                  )  
vs.                            )                                   PROOF OF SERVICE  
                                  )  
FEDEX CORPORATION,           )  
FEDEX EXPRESS, INC., and    )  
FEDEX CORPORATE SERVICES, INC., )  
                                  )  
Defendants.                   )  
                                  )

This is to certify that a true and correct copy of the following:

Defendant-Intervenor Applicant's Notice of Motions and Motion to Intervene and Motion to Disqualify Judge

was delivered in person to the following:

Kirstin M. Ault  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Kyle F. Waldinger  
Assistant United States Attorney  
U.S. Attorney's Office  
450 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

The foregoing was mailed by the undersigned postage prepaid by Priority Mail to the following:

Cristina C. Arguedas  
Raphael M. Goldman  
Ted W. Cassman  
Arguedas, Cassman & Headley, LLP  
803 Hearst Avenue  
Berkeley, CA 94710

Allen Ruby  
Jack P. DiCario  
William J. Casey  
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, LLP  
525 University Avenue, Suite 1100  
Palo Alto, CA 94301

Date: August 1, 2014

*Kuong Lin Ou-Young*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kuong Lin Ou-Young  
260 N. Pastoria Avenue  
Sunnyvale, CA 94086